

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 8-15, 17-21, 24-31, 33-37, 40-47 and 49-84 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12, 15, 17, 24, 33, 40, 44 and 47 are currently amended. Claims 49-84 are new, and find support in Applicant's claims 2-5, 9-11, 18-21, 25-27, 33-37, and 41-43. The amendment to claim 1 finds support at canceled claims 6-7. The amendment to claim 17 finds support at canceled claims 22-23. The amendment to claim 33 finds support at canceled claims 38-39. Claims 8, 12, 15, 24, 40, 44 and 47 have only been rewritten into independent form. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102

Claims 1-8, 12-15, 17-24, 28-31, 33-40 and 44-47 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by US patent no. 6,178,511 to Cohen et al. Claims 6-7, 22-23 and 38-39 have been cancelled rendering their rejections moot. Each of claims 1-5, 8, 12-15, 17-21, 24, 28-31, 33-37, 40, and 44-47, as now amended, is allowable for the following reason. Cohen, et al., do not disclose each and every element of any of amended claims 1-5, 8, 12-15, 17-21, 24, 28-31, 33-37, 40, and 44-47. In this regard, the rejections of claims 7, 8, 12-15, 23, 24, 28-31, 39, 40 and 44-47 are respectfully traversed.

Specifically, **amended claim 1** now recites storing at the enterprise server multiple security credentials for a remote user to access respective secure resources residing on a network employing a generic application layer network protocol; maintaining a map between one or more resource servers and a type of security credential required to access each resource server; receiving at the enterprise server a signal representing a first request from a remote user for a first of the secure resources, wherein the request includes a logon credential for the remote user; determining, by referring to the map and without the intervention of the user, the type of security credential for the remote user that is required to access the first secure resource; and sending from the server a signal

representing a second request to retrieve the first secure resource, the second request including a first of the security credentials for the user of the type required to access the first secure resource. In addition, amended claim 1 recites (i) receiving at the server a signal representing a first single-sign-on (SSO) credential generated by a first SSO provider based on the login credential; and (ii) sending from the server a signal representing the first SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes the first SSO credential; and (iii) sending from the server a signal representing the first SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes a second SSO credential corresponding to a second SSO provider having a trust relationship with the first SSO provider.

As understood, Cohen do not disclose the element “sending from the server a signal representing the first SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes a second SSO credential corresponding to a second SSO provider having a trust relationship with the first SSO provider, as recited at Applicants’ amended claim 1. The Examiner has cited Figure 10, column 8, lines 1-67, column 9, lines 1-67 and column 15, lines 1-67 of Cohen et al. as meeting this advantageous feature of Applicant’s claimed invention. However, a thorough review of these portions of Cohen et al. reveals that they do not teach such pair of SSO providers having such trust relationship, nor sending a first SSO credential when the type required to access a first secure resource including a second SSO credential corresponding to a second SSO provider having the trust relationship with the first SSO provider. If the Examiner disagrees, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out specifically where this element is disclosed by Cohen et al.

Claims 2-5 are allowable as being dependent from amended claim 1. Amended claims 17 and 33 are allowable for the same reasons as amended

claim 1, and claims 18-21 and 34-37 are allowable as a being dependent from amended claims 17 and 33, respectively.

In addition, **claim 8**, as now amended, recites the elements of claim 1 that are duplicated above and not repeated here, except for element (iii). Instead, amended claim 8 recites (iv) receiving at the server a signal representing a second SSO credential generated by a second SSO provider based on the first SSO credential; and (v) sending from the server a signal representing the second SSO credential to retrieve the first secure resource when the type of credential required to access the first secure resource includes the second SSO credential.

As understood, Cohen do not disclose these features. The Examiner has again cited the Figure 10, column 8, lines 1-67, column 9, lines 1-67 and column 15, lines 1-67 of Cohen et al. as meeting these features. However, a thorough review of these portions of Cohen et al. reveals that they do not teach these advantageous features of Applicant's claimed invention. If the Examiner disagrees, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out specifically where this element is disclosed by Cohen et al.

Claims 24 and 40 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 8.

In addition, **claim 12**, as now amended, recites the elements of claim 1 that are duplicated above and not repeated here, except for elements (i), (ii) and (iii). Instead, amended claim 12 recites (vi) that the receiving element further includes receiving at the server a signal representing a third request from the remote user for a second of the secure resources residing on the network; (vii) determining, without the intervention of the user, the type of security credential for the remote user that is required to access the second secure resource; and (viii) sending from the server a signal representing a fourth request for retrieving the second secure resource, the fourth request including a second of the security credentials for the user of the type required to access the second secure resource; and wherein the signals representing the second and fourth requests are sent concurrently.

As understood, Cohen et al., do not disclose these features. The Examiner has cited column 5, lines 1-67, and column 6, lines 1-67 of Cohen et al. as meeting these features. However, a thorough review of these portions of Cohen et al. reveals that they do not teach these advantageous features of Applicant's claimed invention. If the Examiner disagrees, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out specifically where this element is disclosed by Cohen et al.

Claims 13-14 are allowable as being dependent from claim 12. Claims 28 and 44 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 12. Claims 29-30 and 45-46 are allowable as being dependent from claims 28 and 44, respectively.

In addition, **claim 15**, as now amended, recites the elements of claim 1 that are duplicated above and not repeated here, except for elements (i), (ii) and (iii). Instead, claim 15 recites (ix) receiving at the server a signal representing the first security credential from the user before receiving the signal representing the first request. As understood, Cohen do not disclose this feature. The Examiner has cited column 4, lines 1-67, column 5, lines 1-67 and column 6, lines 1-67 of Cohen et al. as meeting this feature. However, a thorough review of these portions of Cohen et al. reveals that they do not teach this advantageous feature of Applicant's claimed invention. If the Examiner disagrees, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out specifically where this element is disclosed by Cohen et al.

Claims 31 and 47 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 9-11, 25-27 and 41-43 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al., and further in view of Rodriguez.

Claims 9-11 are allowable as being dependent from claim 1. Neither Cohen, et al., nor Rodriguez, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests the features of amended claim 1. The reasons have been already set forth

above regarding Cohen, et al., which is the primary reference that the Examiner is citing to meet the features recited at claim 1.

Claims 25-27 are allowable as being dependent from claim 17. Neither Cohen, et al., nor Rodriguez, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the features of amended claim 17. The reasons have been already set forth above regarding Cohen, et al., which is the primary reference that the Examiner is citing to meet the features recited at claim 17.

Claims 41-43 are allowable as being dependent from claim 33. Neither Cohen et al., nor Rodriguez, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the features of amended claim 33. The reasons have been already set forth above regarding Cohen, et al., which is the primary reference that the Examiner is relying upon to meet the features of claim 33.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 49-55 are allowable as being dependent from claim 8.

Claims 56-58 are allowable as being dependent from claim 12.

Claims 59-61 are allowable as being dependent from claim 15.

Claims 62-68 are allowable as being dependent from claim 24.

Claims 69-75 are allowable as being dependent from claim 40.

Claims 76-78 are allowable as being dependent from claim 44.

Claims 79-84 are allowable as being dependent from claim 47.

Appl. No. 10/004,301
Amendment dated May 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed January 20, 2006

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2019. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jackson & Co., LLP

Dated: May 18, 2006

By



Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

JACKSON & CO., LLP
6114 La Salle Ave., #507
Oakland, CA 94611-2802

Telephone: 510-652-6418
Facsimile: 510-652-5691

Customer No.: 30349

Appl. No. 10/004,301
Amendment dated May 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed January 20, 2006

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2019. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jackson & Co., LLP

Dated: May 18, 2006

By



Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

JACKSON & CO., LLP
6114 La Salle Ave., #507
Oakland, CA 94611-2802

Telephone: 510-652-6418
Facsimile: 510-652-5691

Customer No.: 30349